

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-22, and 24-37 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 24, 27, 29 and 34 have been amended. Claims 8, 23 and 36 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 37 has been added. Support for the new claim and the amendments is found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that no new matter has been added.

Claims 24-34 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 24-34 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 24-34 are directed to statutory subject matter of a “computer program product,” as in claim 24. As claimed, the computer program product comprises “a computer-readable medium having stored thereon an electronic form...” Applicants respectfully submit that the feature of having an electronic form stored thereon precludes the claimed computer-readable medium from being a carrier wave. Hence, claims 24-34 are directed to statutory subject matter and are allowable.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18, 24-28, and 30-35 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18, 24-28, 30-36, at paragraph 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm User’s Manual (“OmniForm”), in view of Quality Reexamination Review Sheet (“QRRS”). Claim 36 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of claim 36 moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS do not disclose posting an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, and accepts an infringement submission including first user input to identify an additional infringement target and second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria, as in claim 1. The Office

Action admits that OmniForm does not disclose criteria for infringement or accepting user input to identify an infringement target. *See Office Action*, page 3, ¶ 6.

In contrast to claim 1 and as stated by the Office, “QRRS is a USPTO quality review sheet comprising a paper input form (page 1).” *See Office Action*, page 3, ¶ 6 (emphasis added). Further, QRRS states, “its purpose is only that of an aid in highlighting the particular problem area in the reexamination proceeding.” *See QRRS*, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, QRRS is directed to only “quality review” in the “reexamination proceeding.” QRRS discloses answering questions related to deficiencies in a reexamination proceeding. *See Office Action*, page 3-4. The Office Action states that the input to QRRS questions 1-8 is regarding criteria for infringement. *See Office Action*, page 3-4. However, a quality review of a reexamination proceeding as described by QRRS does not disclose criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 1. Questions 1-8 of QRRS are for reexamination quality, which cannot be equated to criteria for infringement as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, QRRS does not display any type of infringement criteria for a particular patent. Further, the cited portions of QRRS do not disclose second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria, as in claim 1. Rather, questions 1-8 of QRRS are related to quality review of a reexamination proceeding. Thus, questions 1-8 do not receive input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria, as in claim 1.

Further, reexamination and infringement are not equivalent. Rather, reexamination is a procedure before the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) that relates, in pertinent part, to whether a prior art patent or printed publication anticipates or makes obvious one or more claims of the patent being reexamined. The reexamination is carried out according to established procedures for initial examination. *See* 35 U.S.C. §314(a). The reexamination determines whether the patent is valid, and ends with the issuance of a certificate canceling unpatentable claims, confirming claims to be patentable or incorporating amendments to the claims. *See* 35 U.S.C. §316(a). In contrast, infringement relates to whether an unauthorized party makes, uses, offers to sell, sells, or imports a patented invention; actively induces another to do so; or performs other actions associated with contributory infringement. *See* 35 U.S.C. §267. Thus, the issues between reexamination and infringement are different. That is, in reexamination the PTO is comparing issued claims to prior art printed publications and patents to determine

whether the claims themselves are valid. In contrast, to determine infringement, issued claims are compared to the activities or products of an alleged infringer to determine whether the infringer's activities or products fall within the scope of the claims. In an infringement suit, the question of whether the claims are valid may arise, but it is an entirely separate and distinct question from whether the claims are infringed. Thus, QRRS deals with quality review of a reexamination proceeding and does not disclose or suggest describing how an additional infringement target meets the criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 1.

Additionally, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS do not disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Neither OmniForm nor QRRS related to infringement or the identification of infringement target; hence, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS do not disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of QRRS and OmniForm, alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 35 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, the cited portions of QRRS and OmniForm fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 35. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 35 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

In addition, claim 12 recites additional features that are not disclosed by the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose or suggest determining a first-received on-point infringement submission based upon evaluating each of a plurality of infringement submissions and based upon a date and time when each of the plurality of infringement submissions was received, as in claim 12. The Office Action admits that OmniForm does not teach evaluating each of the plurality of infringement submissions, but states that "QRRS teaches that its form is for entering of information (submission) to be evaluated accordingly." *Office Action*, p. 4. Applicants respectfully submit that since QRRS accepts input related to quality of reexamination proceeding, QRRS does not disclose evaluating a plurality of infringement submissions, as in claim 12. Hence, claim 12 is

allowable for at least this additional reason. Further, claims 13 and 18 depend from claim 12 and are, therefore, also allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 24

The cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose an electronic form to “display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement target and to accept first user input to identify an additional infringement targets and second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria,” as in claim 24. The Office Action admits that OmniForm does not disclose criteria for infringement or accepting user input to identify an infringement target. *See Office Action*, page 3, ¶ 6.

In contrast to claim 24 and as stated by the Office, “QRRS is a USPTO quality review sheet comprising a paper input form (page 1).” *See Office Action*, page 3, ¶ 6. Further, the QRRS states, “its purpose is only that of an aid in highlighting the particular problem area in the reexamination proceeding.” *See QRRS*, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, QRRS is directed to only “quality review” in the “reexamination proceeding.” QRRS discloses answering questions 1-8 related to deficiencies in a reexamination proceeding. *See Office Action*, page 3-4. The Office Action states that the input to QRRS questions 1-8 is regarding criteria for infringement. *See Office Action*, page 3-4. However, a quality review of a reexamination proceeding as described by QRRS does not disclose criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 24. Questions 1-8 of QRRS are for reexamination quality, which cannot be equated criteria for infringement as in claim 24. In contrast to claim 24, QRRS does not display any type of infringement criteria for a particular patent. Further, the cited portions of QRRS do not disclose second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria, as in claim 24. Rather, questions 1-8 of QRRS are related to quality review of a reexamination proceeding.

Further, as discussed above, reexamination and infringement are not equivalent. Rather, reexamination determines whether the patent is valid, and ends with the issuance of a certificate

canceling unpatentable claims, confirming claims to be patentable or incorporating amendments to the claims. *See* 35 U.S.C. §316(a). In contrast, infringement relates to whether an unauthorized party makes, uses, offers to sell, sells or imports a patented invention, actively induces another to do so, or performs other actions associated with contributory infringement. *See* 35 U.S.C. §267. Thus, QRSS deals with quality review of a reexamination proceeding and does not disclose or suggest describing how an additional infringement target meets the criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 24.

Moreover, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRSS fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Therefore, QRSS and OmniForm, taken separately or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of claim 24. Hence, claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25-28 and 30-34 depend from claim 24, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the cited portions of QRSS and OmniForm, taken separately or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 25-28 and 30-34. Accordingly, claims 25-28 and 30-34 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 24.

Claims 6, 19 and 29 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 6, 19 and 29, at paragraph 7 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm in view of QRSS, and further in view of BountyQuest Website ("BountyQuest"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 6 and 19 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRSS do not disclose at least one element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRSS fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. The cited portions of BountyQuest also fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Therefore, OmniForm, QRSS, and BountyQuest, separately

or in combination, do not disclose at least one element of claim 1, or of claims 6 and 19, which depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 6 and 19 are allowable.

Claim 29 depends from claim 24. As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS do not disclose at least one element of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. The cited portions of BountyQuest also fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Therefore, the cited portions of OmniForm, QRRS, and BountyQuest, separately or in combination, do not disclose at least one element of claim 24, or of claim 29, which depends from claim 24. Therefore, claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 10-11, 14-17, and 20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 10-11, 14-17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm in view of QRRS, and further in view of European Patent No. EP 1,160,708 (“Utsumi”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS do not disclose at least one element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRS fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. The cited portions of Utsumi also do not disclose an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of OmniForm, QRRS, and Utsumi fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1, and of claims 10-11, 14-17, and 20, which depend from claim 1.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18, 24-28, and 30-35 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18, 24-28, and 30-36, at p. 8 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm User’s Manual (“OmniForm”), in view of Quality Review Reexamination – Part 1 (“QRRP1”). Claim 36 has

been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of claim 36 moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose posting an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and accepts first user input to identify an additional infringement target and second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria, as in claim 1. The Office Action admits that OmniForm does not disclose criteria for infringement or accepting second user input to describe how the infringement target meets the criteria. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1.

In contrast to claim 1 and as stated by the Office, “QRRP1 is a USPTO quality review sheet comprising a paper input form (pages 1, 2).” *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Further, QRRP1 states, that “its purpose is only that of an aid in highlighting the particular problem area in the reexamination proceeding.” *See QRRP1*, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, QRRP1 is directed to only “quality review” in the “reexamination proceeding.” QRRP1 discloses answering questions related to deficiencies in a reexamination proceeding. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1. The Office Action states that the input to QRRP1 questions 1-8 is regarding criteria for infringement. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1. However, a quality review of a reexamination proceeding as described by QRRP1 does not disclose criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, QRRP1 does not display any type of criteria for infringement of a particular patent.

Further, as discussed above, reexamination and infringement are not equivalent. Rather, reexamination determines whether a patent is valid. *See* 35 U.S.C. §316(a). In contrast, infringement relates to whether an unauthorized party makes, uses, offers to sell, sells, or imports a patented invention; actively induces another to do so; or performs other actions associated with contributory infringement. *See* 35 U.S.C. §267. Thus, QRRP1 deals with quality review of a reexamination proceeding and does not disclose or suggest describing how an additional infringement target meets the criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 1.

Additionally, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Neither OmniForm nor QRRP1 related to infringement or the identification of infringement targets;

hence, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of QRRP1 and OmniForm, alone or in combination fail to disclose at least one element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18 and 35 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, the cited portions of QRRP1 and OmniForm fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18 and 35. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18 and 35 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

In addition, claim 12 recites additional features that are not disclosed by the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest determining a first-received on-point infringement submission based upon evaluating each of the plurality of infringement submissions and based upon a date and time when each of the plurality of infringement submissions was received, as in claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable for these additional reasons. The Office Action admits that OmniForm does not teach evaluating each of the plurality of infringement submissions, but states that “QRRP1 teaches that its form is for entering of information (submission) to be evaluated accordingly.” *Office Action*, p. 9 and 10. Applicants respectfully submit that since QRRP1 accepts input related to quality of reexamination proceeding, QRRP1 does not disclose evaluating a plurality of infringement submissions, as in claim 12. Hence, claim 12 is allowable for at least this additional reason. Further, claims 13 and 18 depend from claim 12 and are, therefore, also allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 24

The cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose an electronic form to “display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets and to accept first user input to identify an additionally infringement target and second user input to describe how the additional infringement target meets the criteria,” as in claim 24. The Office Action admits that OmniForm does not disclose

criteria for infringement or accepting second user input to describe how the infringement target meets the criteria. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1 (emphasis added).

In contrast to claim 24 and as stated by the Office, “QRRP1 is a USPTO quality review sheet comprising a paper input form (pages 1, 2).” *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Further, QRRP1 states, “its purpose is only that of an aid in highlighting the particular problem area in the reexamination proceeding.” *See QRRP1*, ¶ 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, QRRP1 is directed to only “quality review” in the “reexamination proceeding.” QRRP1 discloses answering questions related to deficiencies in a reexamination proceeding. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1. The Office Action states that the input to QRRP1 questions 1-8 is regarding criteria for infringement. *See Office Action*, page 9, ¶ 1. However, a quality review of a reexamination proceeding as described by QRRP1 does not disclose criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 24. In contrast to claim 24, QRRP1 does not display any type of criteria for infringement of a particular patent.

Further, as discussed above, reexamination and infringement are not equivalent. Rather, reexamination determines whether the patent is valid, and ends with the issuance of a certificate canceling unpatentable claims, confirming claims to be patentable or incorporating amendments to the claims. *See* 35 U.S.C. §316(a). In contrast, infringement relates to whether an unauthorized party makes, uses, offers to sell, sells or imports a patented invention, actively induces another to do so, or performs other actions associated with contributory infringement. *See* 35 U.S.C. §267. Thus, QRRP1 deals with quality review of a reexamination proceeding and does not disclose or suggest describing how an additional infringement target meets the criteria for infringement of a particular patent, as in claim 24.

Moreover, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Therefore, QRRP1 and OmniForm, taken separately or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of claim 24. Hence, claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25-28 and 30-34 depend from claim 24, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, QRRP1 and OmniForm, taken separately or in combination, fail to disclose at

least one element of each of claims 25-28 and 30-34. Accordingly, claims 25-28 and 30-34 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 24.

Claims 6, 19 and 29 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 6, 19 and 29, at paragraph 10 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm in view of QRRP1, and further in view of BountyQuest Website (“BountyQuest”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 6 and 19 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose at least one element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. The cited portions of BountyQuest also fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Therefore, OmniForm, QRRP1, and BountyQuest, separately or in combination, do not disclose at least one element of claim 1, or of claims 6 and 19, which depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 6 and 19 are allowable.

Claim 29 depends from claim 24. As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose at least one element of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. The cited portions of BountyQuest also fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Therefore, the cited portions of OmniForm, QRRP1, and BountyQuest, separately or in combination, do not disclose at least one element of claim 24, or of claim 29, which depends from claim 24. Therefore, claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 10-11, 14-17, and 20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 10-11, 14-17, and 20, at paragraph 11 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over OmniForm in view of QRRP1, and further in view of Utsumi. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As explained above, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 do not disclose at least one element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of OmniForm and QRRP1 fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. The cited portions of Utsumi also do not disclose an electronic form that displays criteria for infringement of a particular patent and any currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of OmniForm, QRRP1, and Utsumi fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1, and of claims 10-11, 15-17, and 20, which depend from claim 1.

Claims 1-7, 9-22, and 24-35 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-7, 9-22, and 24-36, at paragraph 12 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Utsumi in view of BountyQuest. Claim 36 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of claim 36 moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose posting an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Utsumi discloses a charging system that solicits information from third parties about products that supposedly infringe on a right holder's lawful right. *Utsumi*, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Utsumi do not disclose an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Also in contrast to claim 1, BountyQuest discloses displaying "bounties", finding a document with required information, and collecting the "bounty". *BountyQuest*, Main Page, p. 3. However, the cited portions of BountyQuest do not disclose an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-7, 9-22, and 35 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, the cited portions of Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-7, 9-22, and 35. Accordingly, claims 2-7, 9-22, and 35 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 24

The cited portions of Utsumi and Bounty Quest fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. In contrast to claim 24, Utsumi discloses a charging system that solicits information from third parties about products that supposedly infringe on a right holder's lawful right. *Utsumi*, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Utsumi do not disclose an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Also in contrast to claim 24, BountyQuest discloses displaying "bounties", finding a document with required information, and collecting the "bounty". *BountyQuest*, Main Page, p. 3. However, the cited portions of BountyQuest do not disclose an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Hence, claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25-34 depend from claim 24, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the cited portions of Utsumi and BountyQuest, separately or in combination, fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 25-34. Accordingly, claims 25-34 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 24.

New Claim 37 is Allowable

New claim 37 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claim 37 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, the cited portions of OmniForm, QRRS, QRRP1, Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose at least one element of claim 1. Accordingly, the cited portions of OmniForm, QRRS, QRRP1, Utsumi and BountyQuest fail to disclose at least one element of claim 37. Therefore, claim 37 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the cited references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

Oct. 23, 2008
Date


Jason L. Moore, Reg. No. 52,046
Attorney for Applicants
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)